arXiv:1603.06035v1 [cs.LG] 19 Mar 2016

L_0-norm Sparse Graph-regularized SVD for Biclustering

Wenwen Min[1], Juan Liu[1*], and Shihua Zhang[2*]
[1]School of Computer, Wuhan University, Wuhan 430072, China
[2]National Center for Mathematics and Interdisciplinary Sciences, Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China
mww@whu.edu.cn, liujuan@whu.edu.cn and zsh@amss.ac.cn

Abstract

Learning the "blocking" structure is a central challenge for high dimensional data (e.g., gene expression data). In [Lee *et al.*, 2010], a sparse singular value decomposition (SVD) has been used as a biclustering tool to achieve this goal. However, this model ignores the structural information between variables (e.g., gene interaction graph). Although typical graph-regularized norm can incorporate such prior graph information to get accurate discovery and better interpretability, it fails to consider the opposite effect of variables with different signs. Motivated by the development of sparse coding and graph-regularized norm, we propose a novel sparse graph-regularized SVD as a powerful biclustering tool for analyzing high-dimensional data. The key of this method is to impose two penalties including a novel graph-regularized norm ($|\boldsymbol{u}|\boldsymbol{L}|\boldsymbol{u}|$) and L_0-norm ($\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_0$) on singular vectors to induce structural sparsity and enhance interpretability. We design an efficient Alternating Iterative Sparse Projection (AISP) algorithm to solve it. Finally, we apply our method and related ones to simulated and real data to show its efficiency in capturing natural blocking structures.

1 Introduction

Singular Value Decomposition (SVD) is a powerful matrix decomposition model which has been widely used in different fields [Alter *et al.*, 2000; Aharon *et al.*, 2006; Zhou *et al.*, 2015]. Suppose $\boldsymbol{X}$ is a matrix of size $n \times p$ (e.g., a gene expression matrix), then the classical SVD of $\boldsymbol{X}$ is:

$$\boldsymbol{X} = \boldsymbol{U}\boldsymbol{D}\boldsymbol{V}^T = \sum_{k=1}^{r} d_k \boldsymbol{u_k} \boldsymbol{v_k}, \tag{1}$$

where r is the rank of $\boldsymbol{X}$, $\boldsymbol{u_k}$ and $\boldsymbol{v_k}(k = 1, \cdots, r)$ are left and right singular vectors respectively, and both $\boldsymbol{U} = (\boldsymbol{u}_1, \cdots, \boldsymbol{u}_r)$ and $\boldsymbol{V} = (\boldsymbol{v}_1, \cdots, \boldsymbol{v}_r)$ are orthogonal matrices. The $\boldsymbol{D} = \text{diag}(d_1, d_2, \cdots, d_r)$ is a diagonal matrix. However, the non-sparse singular vectors ($\boldsymbol{u}_k$, $\boldsymbol{v}_k$) can sometimes be difficult to interpret. Many studies impose sparsity on singular vectors to improve this [Shi *et al.*, 2013; Jing *et al.*, 2015]. The advantage of sparsity is that the sparse singular vectors are better able to capture inherent structures and patterns of the input data.

We here introduce a formal framework of the rank one sparse SVD [Witten *et al.*, 2009],

$$\begin{aligned} \underset{\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{v},d}{\text{minimize}} \quad & \|\boldsymbol{X} - d\boldsymbol{u}\boldsymbol{v}^T\|_F^2 \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2 \leq 1, P_1(\boldsymbol{u}) \leq c_1, \\ & \|\boldsymbol{v}\|_2 \leq 1, P_2(\boldsymbol{v}) \leq c_2, \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where $P_1(\boldsymbol{u})$ and $P_2(\boldsymbol{v})$ are two penalty functions. For different purpose, different sparsity penalties can be induced in this framework [Witten *et al.*, 2009; Lee *et al.*, 2010; Sill *et al.*, 2011]. For example, Witten *et al.* [2009] has proposed a penalized matrix decomposition (PMD) by using L_1-penalty to induce sparsity [Witten *et al.*, 2009]. In addition, Lee *et al.* [2010] has developed a sparse SVD (ALSVD) by imposing Adaptive Lasso penalty to the left/right singular vectors and employed it as a biclustering tool to capture bicluster structure of a gene expression data. However, these sparse SVD models have several limitations. First, they impose sparseness via L_1-norm penalty, while little work is concerned with L_0-norm one. Compared to L_1-norm, L_0-norm can enforce to get a desirable level of sparsity. Second, they ignore the prior graph knowledge for variables. Recent studies have shown that graph-regularized penalty can help to get better interpretability and higher generalization performance for regression tasks and others [Ando and Zhang, 2007; Li and Yeung, 2009; Li and Li, 2008; 2010; Jiang *et al.*, 2013]. To our knowledge, there is yet no study to incorporate graph structure into the sparse SVD framework.

In this paper, we propose a novel sparse graph-regularized SVD to model the high-dimensional data with prior graph knowledge. This method is inspired by recent developments of sparse coding and graph-regularized norm [Lee *et al.*, 2006; Ando and Zhang, 2007; Zheng *et al.*, 2011; He *et al.*, 2011]. It imposes a novel graph-regularized norm ($|\boldsymbol{u}|\boldsymbol{L}|\boldsymbol{u}|$) instead of the general one ($\boldsymbol{u}\boldsymbol{L}\boldsymbol{u}$) and the L_0-norm ($\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_0$) penalty on singular vectors to induce structural sparsity. In summary, our key contributions are threefold: (1) impose L_0-norm penalty to graph-regularized SVD (sgSVD); (2) consider smoothing of absolute signal in graph-regularized penalty (sgSVD*); (3) design an efficient Alternating Iterative Sparse Projection (AISP) algorithm to solve

it. Finally, we apply sgSVD* and related methods to simulated and real data to demonstrate its efficiency in capturing blocking data structure.

2 Related Works

Recent studies have a growing interest in regularized SVD including the following main three aspects.

(1) Sparse SVD. Witten *et al.* [2009] proposed the first sparse SVD via L_1-norm and fused lasso as sparsity-inducing norm. Lee *et al.* [2010] recommended to use different penalties, such as Lasso, adaptive Lasso and Smoothly Clipped Absolute Deviation (SCAD), as penalty functions. A natural choice of the penalty function is L_0 norm. Min *et al.* [2015] proposed a sparse SVD via L_0-norm penalty (L0SVD).

(2) Graph-regularized SVD. Graph-regularized norm has been used in many different techniques such as nonnegative matrix factorization [Cai *et al.*, 2011]. However, to our knowledge, there is yet no study to incorporate graph-regularized norm into the sparse SVD framework. We believe that sparse graph-regularized SVD is a promising tool as explored in other problems [Li and Yeung, 2009; Jenatton *et al.*, 2010; Zheng *et al.*, 2011] to enforce the smoothness of variable coefficients. In addition, $L_{2,1}$ is widely used to enforce the structural sparsity at the inter-group level [Jacob *et al.*, 2009]. We can also consider it as a penalty function of SVD in future studies.

(3) The relationship between SVD and PCA. As we all know, principal component analysis (PCA) can be efficiently solved by using SVD. However, the identified non-sparse principal components can sometimes be difficult to interpret. To solve it, recent studies have developed several different sparse PCA models [Deshpande and Montanari, 2014; Gu *et al.*, 2014; Shen and Huang, 2008; Witten *et al.*, 2009]. However, it is difficult to develop effective algorithms for solving these sparse PCA models. There are a kind of commonly used methods based on regularized SVD for solving them [Shen and Huang, 2008]. Moreover, Witten *et al.* [2009] proposed another model based on regularized SVD to ensure the orthogonally of their left singular vectors.

3 The Proposed Approach

3.1 Sparse Graph-regularized Penalty

Given a simple graph G, its Laplacian matrix $\boldsymbol{L}$ is defined as $\boldsymbol{L} = \boldsymbol{D} - \boldsymbol{A}$, where $\boldsymbol{A}$ is the adjacency matrix of graph G, $\boldsymbol{A}_{ij} = 1$ if vertex i and j is connected in the graph, $\boldsymbol{A}_{ij} = 0$ otherwise, and $\boldsymbol{D}$ is a diagonal matrix whose diagonal elements d_i is the degree of vertex i (i.e., $d_i = \sum_{j=1}^{p} \boldsymbol{A}_{ij}$). We first consider the ordinary graph-regularized norm and impose sparsity on singular vectors in SVD framework with the following penalty,

$$P(\boldsymbol{v}) = \lambda_1 \|\boldsymbol{v}\|_1 + \lambda_2 \boldsymbol{v}^T \boldsymbol{L} \boldsymbol{v}, \tag{3}$$

where $\lambda_1 \geq 0$ and $\lambda_2 \geq 0$ are two regularization parameters. The first term $\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_1 = \sum_i |v_i|$ is the L_1-norm penalty to induce sparsity. The second term $\boldsymbol{v}^T \boldsymbol{L} \boldsymbol{v} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \sim j} \boldsymbol{A}_{ij} (v_i - v_j)^2$ is a quadratic Laplacian penalty which forces the coefficients of $\boldsymbol{v}$ to be smooth. Thus, we can create a sparse graph-regularized SVD using the penalty Eq. (3) in the framework Eq. (2). The L_1-norm has some good nature and has been applied to induce sparsity in SVD [Witten *et al.*, 2009]. Whereas little work has been done using a more natural sparseness regularization, i.e., L_0-norm penalty. In this paper, we adopt L_0-norm penalty rather than L_1-norm one to induce sparsity on singular vectors. Thus, we replace Eq. (3) with the following one,

$$P(\boldsymbol{v}) = \lambda_0 \|\boldsymbol{v}\|_0 + \lambda_2 \boldsymbol{v}^T \boldsymbol{L} \boldsymbol{v}, \tag{4}$$

where $\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_0 = \sum_i I(v_i)$ is the L_0-norm penalty.

The classical graph-regularized penalty in Eq. (4) ensures that two positively correlated variables would tend to influence their coefficients in the same direction. However, it makes two negatively correlated variables have opposite effect. Thus, the classical graph-regularized penalty may not perform well when the coefficients of a number of variables linked on the prior graph have different signs. This would lead to the absolute values of their coefficients are not expected to be locally smooth. To solve this drawback, we redefine a sparse graph-regularized penalty by only considering the magnitude of their coefficients,

$$P(\boldsymbol{v}) = \lambda_1 \|\boldsymbol{v}\|_0 + \lambda_2 |\boldsymbol{v}|^T \boldsymbol{L} |\boldsymbol{v}|, \tag{5}$$

where $|\boldsymbol{v}|^T \boldsymbol{L} |\boldsymbol{v}| = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \sim j} \boldsymbol{A}_{ij} (|v_i| - |v_j|)^2$ and $|\boldsymbol{v}| = (|v_1|, |v_2|, \cdots, |v_p|)^T$. This is also reflected by the fact that linked genes in a gene interaction graph are usually significantly positively or negatively correlated. This new penalty Eq. (5) encourages highly inter-correlated variables corresponding to a dense subnetwork in G to be jointly selected.

Mathematically, the normalized Laplacian matrix $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{L}}$ defined by $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{L}} = \boldsymbol{D}^{-1/2} \boldsymbol{L} \boldsymbol{D}^{-1/2}$ can be used to replace $\boldsymbol{L}$ in Eq. (3), Eq. (4), and Eq. (5). The choice of $\boldsymbol{L}$ and normalized $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{L}}$ depends on the specific problems. In addition, there are a wide variety of graph matrix representations [Wilson and Zhu, 2008], which can also be considered to replace $\boldsymbol{L}$. In this paper, we apply the sparse graph-regularized penalty with $\boldsymbol{L}$ for biclustering gene expression data.

3.2 L_1-norm Sparse Graph-regularized SVD

The sparse graph-regularized penalty via L_0-norm is nonconvex, which leads to a challenge issue for efficient implementation. Here, we first discuss a sparse graph-regularized SVD by replacing L_0-norm in Eq.(5) with L_1-norm, denoted as L_1-sgSVD*. Formally, we should deal with the following minimization problem,

$$\begin{aligned} \underset{\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{v},d}{\text{minimize}} \quad & \|\boldsymbol{X} - d\boldsymbol{u}\boldsymbol{v}^T\|_F^2 \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2 \leq 1, \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_1 \leq s_1, |\boldsymbol{u}|^T \boldsymbol{L_1} |\boldsymbol{u}| \leq s_2, \\ & \|\boldsymbol{v}\|_2 \leq 1, \|\boldsymbol{v}\|_1 \leq c_1, |\boldsymbol{v}|^T \boldsymbol{L_2} |\boldsymbol{v}| \leq c_2, \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where d is a positive singular value, $\boldsymbol{u}$ is a $n \times 1$ column vector, $\boldsymbol{v}$ is a $p \times 1$ column vector, both $\boldsymbol{L_1}$ and $\boldsymbol{L_2}$ are Laplace matrices, and s_1, s_2, c_1 and c_2 are four super-parameters.

The objective function $\|\boldsymbol{X} - d\boldsymbol{u}\boldsymbol{v}^T\|_F^2$ in Eq. (6) is biconvex to $\boldsymbol{u}$ and $\boldsymbol{v}$. Thus, we propose an alternating iterative

learning strategy to solve the optimization problem Eq. (6). Next we consider optimization over $\boldsymbol{v}$ for a fixed $\boldsymbol{u}$, and get the following constrained optimization problem,

$$\begin{aligned} \underset{\boldsymbol{v},d}{\text{minimize}} \quad & \|\boldsymbol{X} - d\boldsymbol{u}\boldsymbol{v}^T\|_F^2 \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \|\boldsymbol{v}\|_2 \leq 1, \\ & \|\boldsymbol{v}\|_1 \leq c_1, \\ & |\boldsymbol{v}|^T\boldsymbol{L}|\boldsymbol{v}| \leq c_2. \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

We note that this objective function $||\boldsymbol{X} - d\boldsymbol{u}\boldsymbol{v}^t||_F^2 = \|\boldsymbol{X}\|_F^2 - 2d\boldsymbol{u}^T\boldsymbol{X}\boldsymbol{v} + d^2$. Obviously, minimizing this function $||\boldsymbol{X} - d\boldsymbol{u}\boldsymbol{v}^T||_F^2$ is equivalent to minimizing $-\boldsymbol{u}\boldsymbol{X}\boldsymbol{v}$. Let $\boldsymbol{z} = \boldsymbol{X}^T\boldsymbol{u}$. The problem Eq. (7) can thus be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \underset{\boldsymbol{v}}{\text{minimize}} \quad & -\boldsymbol{v}^T\boldsymbol{z} \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \|\boldsymbol{v}\|_2 \leq 1, \\ & \|\boldsymbol{v}\|_1 \leq c_1, \\ & |\boldsymbol{v}|^T\boldsymbol{L}|\boldsymbol{v}| \leq c_2. \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

The $|\boldsymbol{v}|^T\boldsymbol{L}|\boldsymbol{v}|$ is general non-convex, which leads to a challenge issue for solving the problem Eq. (8). Next we propose Theorem 1 to cleverly remove the absolute operator in the constrained condition.

Theorem 1. *Suppose $\boldsymbol{v}^*$ is an optimal solution of Eq. (8), then $v_i^* z_i \geq 0$ for all i.*

Proof. Suppose the Theorem is false. Then there is at least exists i to meet $v_i^* z_i < 0$. We first construct a vector $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{v}}$ which satisfies $\widetilde{v}_j = v_j^*$ for all $j \neq i$ and $\widetilde{v}_i = -v_i^*$. Obviously, the vector $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{v}}$ meets $\|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{v}}\|_0 = \|\boldsymbol{v}^*\|_0$ and $\|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{v}}\|_2 = \|\boldsymbol{v}^*\|_2$. Let $f_1 = -\boldsymbol{v}^*\boldsymbol{z}$ and $f_2 = -\widetilde{\boldsymbol{v}}\boldsymbol{z}$, then $f_1 - f_2 = -2v_i^* z_i > 0$ (i.e., $f_2 < f_1$). Thus, we get a vector $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{v}}$ which corresponds to a more smaller objective value than that of the optimal solution $\boldsymbol{v}^*$. It leads to a desired contradiction. Thus, the Theorem is true. □

Based on Theorem 1, we can replace Eq. (8) with the following optimization problem,

$$\begin{aligned} \underset{\boldsymbol{v}}{\text{minimize}} \quad & -\boldsymbol{v}^T|\boldsymbol{z}| \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \|\boldsymbol{v}\|_2 \leq 1, \\ & \|\boldsymbol{v}\|_1 \leq c_1, \\ & \boldsymbol{v}^T\boldsymbol{L}\boldsymbol{v} \leq c_2, \\ & v_k \geq 0, \forall k, \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where $|\boldsymbol{z}| = (|z_1|, ..., |z_p|)^T$. A standard way to solve the optimization problem Eq. (9) is to formulate the Lagrangian form as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{v}) = -\boldsymbol{v}^T|\boldsymbol{z}| + \lambda\sum_{i=1}^{p} v_i + \frac{1}{2}\eta\boldsymbol{v}^T\boldsymbol{v} + \frac{1}{2}\sigma\boldsymbol{v}^T\boldsymbol{L}\boldsymbol{v} - \sum_{i=1}^{p}\tau_i v_i, \tag{10}$$

where $\lambda \geq 0, \eta \geq 0, \sigma \geq 0, \tau_i \geq 0$ are Lagrangian multipliers. Actually, we can easily get Theorem 2 to confirm the function Eq. (10) is a convex function (we omit the proof here).

Theorem 2. *The function Eq. (10) is a convex function.*

Thus, the optimal solution of Eq. (10) is characterized by its subgradient equation as follows:

$$\nabla_{\boldsymbol{v}}\mathcal{L} = -|\boldsymbol{z}| + \lambda\boldsymbol{e} + \eta\boldsymbol{v} + \sigma\boldsymbol{L}\boldsymbol{v} - \boldsymbol{\tau} = \boldsymbol{0}. \tag{11}$$

Ideally, we can get the optimal solution of Eq. (10) by solving the corresponding linear system in Eq. (11). However, this is inefficient due to the numerical difficulty of inverting a Hessian matrix. As an alternative way, we adopt a simple coordinate descent method [Friedman *et al.*, 2007] to learn vector $\boldsymbol{v}$. The subgradient of v_k in Eq. (10) is

$$\frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial v_k} = -|z_k| + \lambda + \eta v_k + \sigma d_k v_k - \sigma\boldsymbol{A}_k\boldsymbol{v} - \tau_k, \tag{12}$$

where d_k is the degree of node k and $\boldsymbol{A}_k$ is the kth column of the adjacency matrix $\boldsymbol{A}$. The complementary slackness KKT condition implies that if $v_k > 0$, then $\tau_k = 0$ and if $v_k = 0$, then $\tau_k > 0$. Thus, let Eq. (12) be zero, then

$$v_k = \frac{\max(|z_k| + \sigma\boldsymbol{A}_k\boldsymbol{v} - \lambda, 0)}{\eta + \sigma d_k}, k = 1, 2, \cdots \tag{13}$$

Let $\check{v}_k = \max(|z_k| + \sigma\boldsymbol{A}_k\boldsymbol{v} - \lambda, 0)$, and $\check{\boldsymbol{v}} = (\check{v}_1, ..., \check{v}_p)^T$. To meet the normalizing condition, we let $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}} = \frac{\check{\boldsymbol{v}}}{\|\check{\boldsymbol{v}}\|_2}$. Finally, based on Theorem 1, we get the optimal solution of Eq. (7) as follows:

$$\boldsymbol{v} = \tilde{\boldsymbol{v}} \bullet \text{sign}(\boldsymbol{z}), \tag{14}$$

where " $\bullet$ " denotes element-wise product. Likewise, fixed $\boldsymbol{u}$ in Eq. (6), we can obtain the coordinate update for $\boldsymbol{u}$.

Algorithm 1 L_1**-sgSVD***.

Require: Data matrix $\boldsymbol{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times p}$; Prior networks $\boldsymbol{A^1} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ and $\boldsymbol{A^2} \in \mathbb{R}^{p\times p}$; Parameters $\lambda_u, \lambda_v, \sigma_u, \sigma_v$.
Ensure: $\boldsymbol{u}$, $\boldsymbol{v}$, d.

```
Initialize v with ||v||_2 = 1
repeat
    Let z = Xv, A = A^1 and u = |u|
    for i = 1 to n do
        u_i = max(|z_i| + σ_u A_i u − λ_u, 0)
    end for
    u = u / ||u||_2
    u = u • sign(z)
    Let z = X^T u, A = A^2 and v = |v|
    for k = 1 to p do
        v_k = max(|z_k| + σ_v A_k v − λ_v, 0)
    end for
    v = v / ||v||_2
    v = v • sign(z)
    d = z^T v
until d convergence
return u, v, d.
```

However, there are still two problems remain unresolved: (1) How to solve the singular value d? (2) What is the termination condition to stop the iterations? Note that the objective function of Eq. (6), $\|\boldsymbol{X} - d\boldsymbol{u}\boldsymbol{v}^T\|_F^2 = \|\boldsymbol{X}\|_F^2 - 2d\boldsymbol{u}^T\boldsymbol{X}\boldsymbol{v} + d^2$. Given $\boldsymbol{u}$ and $\boldsymbol{v}$, this is a quadratic function about d. Hence the

optimal solution $d^* = \boldsymbol{u}^T \boldsymbol{X} \boldsymbol{v}$, and the corresponding optimal value is $\|\boldsymbol{X}\|_F^2 - d^{*2}$. Note that the minimum is only related with d. Therefore, we can control iteration by monitoring the change of d. Once the change of d is smaller than a small positive constant ϵ, where ϵ represents a tolerance level, we stop the iterations. Finally, we solve the optimization problem Eq. (6) (Lagrangian form) by using an efficient Alternating Iterative Projection Algorithm (Algorithm 1). Note that the time complexity of Algorithm 1 is $\mathcal{O}(Tnp + Tp^2 + Tn^2)$, where T is the number of iterations.

3.3 L_0-norm Sparse Graph-regularized SVD

In this section, we consider a novel sparse graph-regularized SVD via L_0-norm (denoted as L_0-sgSVD* or sgSVD*) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \underset{\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{v},d}{\text{minimize}} \quad & \|\boldsymbol{X} - d\boldsymbol{u}\boldsymbol{v}^T\|_F^2 \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2 \leq 1, \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_0 \leq k_u, |\boldsymbol{u}|^T \boldsymbol{L_1} |\boldsymbol{u}| \leq c_1, \\ & \|\boldsymbol{v}\|_2 \leq 1, \|\boldsymbol{v}\|_0 \leq k_v, |\boldsymbol{v}|^T \boldsymbol{L_2} |\boldsymbol{v}| \leq c_2. \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

To solve problem Eq. (15), we first fix $\boldsymbol{u}$ and let $\boldsymbol{z} = \boldsymbol{X}^T \boldsymbol{u}$. We then get the following optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \underset{\boldsymbol{v}}{\text{minimize}} \quad & -\boldsymbol{v}^T \boldsymbol{z} \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \|\boldsymbol{v}\|_2 \leq 1, \\ & \|\boldsymbol{v}\|_0 \leq k_v, \\ & |\boldsymbol{v}|^T \boldsymbol{L} |\boldsymbol{v}| \leq c_2. \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

Similar with Theorem 1, we also have Theorem 3 to cleverly remove the absolute operator in the last constrained condition of Eq. (16).

Theorem 3. *Suppose $\boldsymbol{v}^*$ is an optimal solution of Eq. (16), then $v_i^* z_i \geq 0$ for all i.*

Therefore, to solve Eq. (16), we first solve the following optimization problem,

$$\begin{aligned} \underset{\boldsymbol{v}}{\text{minimize}} \quad & -\boldsymbol{v}^T |\boldsymbol{z}| \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \|\boldsymbol{v}\|_2 \leq 1, \\ & \|\boldsymbol{v}\|_0 \leq k_v, \\ & \boldsymbol{v}^T \boldsymbol{L} \boldsymbol{v} \leq c_2, \\ & v_k \geq 0, \forall k. \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

We can further consider the following problem,

$$\begin{aligned} \underset{\boldsymbol{v}}{\text{minimize}} \quad & f(\boldsymbol{v}) \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \|\boldsymbol{v}\|_0 \leq k_v, \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

where $f(\boldsymbol{v}) = -\boldsymbol{v}^T |\boldsymbol{z}| + \frac{1}{2}\eta \boldsymbol{v}^T \boldsymbol{v} + \frac{1}{2}\sigma \boldsymbol{v}^T \boldsymbol{L} \boldsymbol{v} - \sum_{i=1}^p \tau_i v_i$, and $\eta \geq 0, \sigma \geq 0, \tau_i \geq 0$ are Lagrangian multipliers. Similar with Theorem 2, we can also prove $f(\boldsymbol{v})$ is a convex function. Note that when $\sigma = 0$, Eq. (18) corresponds to L0SVD. If we remove the constrained condition $\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_0 \leq k_v$ in problem Eq. (18), then we can obtain an update rule for $\boldsymbol{v}$ by using coordinate descent method [Friedman *et al.*, 2007] (the derivation is similar to Eq. (13)). The complementary slackness KKT condition implies that if $v_k > 0$, then $\tau_k = 0$ and if $v_k = 0$, then $\tau_k > 0$. Thus, we obtain the following update rule,

$$v_k = \frac{\max(|z_k| + \sigma \boldsymbol{A}_k \boldsymbol{v}, 0)}{\eta + \sigma d_k}, k = 1, 2, \cdots \tag{19}$$

Let $\check{v}_k = \max(|z_k| + \sigma \boldsymbol{A}_k \boldsymbol{v}, 0)$ and $\boldsymbol{v} = (\check{v}_1, ..., \check{v}_p)^T$. To satisfy the condition $\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_0 \leq k_v$, we force the $p - k_v$ elements of $\boldsymbol{v}$ with the smallest absolute values to be zeros, i.e., project the vector $\boldsymbol{v}$ onto the closets absolute vector in Euclidean space,

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{v}} = \boldsymbol{v} \bullet I(|\boldsymbol{v}| \geq |\boldsymbol{v}|_{(k_v)}), \tag{20}$$

where $I(\cdot)$ is the indicator function, " $\bullet$ " denotes element-wise product and $|\boldsymbol{v}|_{(k_v)}$ denotes the k_v-th order statistic of $|\boldsymbol{v}|$. To meet the normalizing condition, let $\widehat{\boldsymbol{v}} = \widehat{\boldsymbol{v}}/\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{v}}\|_2$. Based on Theorem 3, we can get a feasible solution of Eq. (16) as follows,

$$\boldsymbol{v} = \widehat{\boldsymbol{v}} \bullet \text{sign}(\boldsymbol{z}). \tag{21}$$

Hence, we obtain an approximate solution of Eq. (16) by using a sparse projection strategy. Note that the iterative way of Eq. (20) is consistent with the iterative threshold algorithm [She, 2009]. In the same manner, for a fixed $\boldsymbol{v}$, we can also obtain the coordinate update of $\boldsymbol{u}$.

Finally, we propose an Alternating Iterative Sparse Projection (AISP) algorithm (Algorithm 2) to solve the optimization problem (15) (Lagrangian form). When $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2 = 0$, L_0-sgSVD* algorithm reduces to L0SVD [Min *et al.*, 2015]. We can prove the Eq. (21) is optimal solution for rank one L0SVD model by fixing $\boldsymbol{u}$. In addition, prior graph information is considered to be more important with large σ_u (σ_v). Moreover, Algorithm 2 has the same time complexity with Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 2 L_0**-sgSVD***.

Require: Data matrix $\boldsymbol{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$; Prior networks $\boldsymbol{A^1} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $\boldsymbol{A^2} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$; Parameters $k_u, k_v, \sigma_u, \sigma_v$.
Ensure: $\boldsymbol{u}$, $\boldsymbol{v}$, d.

```
Initialize v with ||v||_2 = 1
repeat
    Let z = Xv, A = A^1 and u = |u|
    for i = 1 to n do
        ŭ_i = |z_i| + σ_u A_i u
    end for
    u = ŭ • I(|ŭ| ≥ |ŭ|_(k_u))
    û = u / ||u||_2
    u = û • sign(z)
    Let z = X^T u and A = A^2
    for k = 1 to p do
        v̆_k = |z_k| + σ_v A_k v
    end for
    v = v̆ • I(|v̆| ≥ |v̆|_(k_v))
    v̂ = v / ||v||_2
    v = v̂ • sign(z)
    d = z^T v
until d convergence
return u, v, d.
```



Figure 1: (A) Illustration of sgSVD*, sgSVD and L0SVD with a toy example ($\gamma = 0.06$) to explain the difference among them. (B, C) Evaluation of different methods using simulation data with two cases. (B) The signs of coefficients in left (or right) singular vector are forced to be the same. (C) The signs of coefficients in left (or right) singular vector are chosen at random. Note that we only show the results for $\boldsymbol{v}$ due to the symmetry of $\boldsymbol{u}$ and $\boldsymbol{v}$ in form.

4 Experiments

4.1 Synthetic Data Experiments

Here, we evaluate the performance of sgSVD* with simulated data and compare its performance with sgSVD, L0SVD [Min *et al.*, 2015], ALSVD [Lee *et al.*, 2010] and SCADSVD (sparse SVD via SCAD penalty) [Fan and Li, 2001].

Without loss of generality, we let a rank-one true signal matrix $\boldsymbol{X}^* = d\boldsymbol{u}\boldsymbol{v}^T$ and $d = 1$, where $\boldsymbol{u}$ and $\boldsymbol{v}$ are vectors of size $n \times 1$ and $p \times 1$, respectively. The observed matrix $\boldsymbol{X}$ is generated as the sum of $\boldsymbol{X}^*$ and a noise matrix $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$, i.e., $\boldsymbol{X} = \boldsymbol{u}\boldsymbol{v}^T + \gamma\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$, where the elements of $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ are randomly sampled from a standard normal distribution (i.e., $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{ij} \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)$), and γ is a nonnegative parameter to control the signal-to-noise ratio. Accordingly, we generate two sparse singular vectors $\boldsymbol{u}$ and $\boldsymbol{v}$ with $n = p = 100$ as follows:

$$\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}} = [sample(\{-1,1\},50), rep(0,50)], \boldsymbol{u} = \widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}}/\|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_2,$$

$$\widetilde{\boldsymbol{v}} = [sample(\{-1,1\},50), rep(0,50)], \boldsymbol{v} = \widetilde{\boldsymbol{v}}/\|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{v}}\|_2,$$

where $sample(\{-1,1\}, a)$ denotes a vector of size a, whose elements are sampled from $\{-1,1\}$, and $rep(0,b)$ denotes a vector of size b, whose elements are zeros. Here we create a data matrix $\boldsymbol{X}$ for each γ ranging from 0.02 to 0.06 in steps of 0.005 and two prior graphs for row and column variables of $\boldsymbol{X}$, whose first 50 vertexes are connected with probability $p_{11} = 0.3$, and remaining ones are connected with probability $p_{12} = 0.1$. Moreover, to test sgSVD whether depends on the signs of singular vectors, we also simulate the data generated from the variables with the same signs by setting $\boldsymbol{u} := |\boldsymbol{u}|$ and $\boldsymbol{v} := -|\boldsymbol{v}|$ with the same parameters (e.g., n, p, γ).

We apply the five methods to the simulation data with $\sigma_u = 0.1$ and $\sigma_v = 0.1$ which are selected by using cross validation strategy. We enforce each singular vector ($\boldsymbol{u}$ or $\boldsymbol{v}$) to contain 50 non-zeros elements (the same sparsity level) for each method by tuning the parameters to get comparable results for different methods. We first demonstrate the magnitude of singular vectors with absolute operator is how to overcome the opposite effect of classical graph-regularized penalty with a simple example which corresponds to Figure 1C with $\gamma = 0.06$ (Figure 1A). Moreover, we can clearly find that the performance on both sensitivity and specificity of sgSVD* and sgSVD are superior to that of L0SVD, ALSVD and SCADSVD (Figure 1B). As to the signals with diverse signs, sgSVD* demonstrates distinct better performance than sgSVD and others (Figure 1C). These results suggest that (1) sgSVD* indeed show effectiveness compared to other methods (e.g., sgSVD and L0SVD); (2) sgSVD does suffer distinct limitations when some connected variables in the prior graph have different signal signs.

4.2 Applications to Gene Expression Data

We apply sgSVD* to two cancer gene expression datasets to demonstrate its effectiveness in deciphering sample-specific gene modules. We download a gene expression dataset from the Cancer Genome Project (CGP) [Garnett *et al.*, 2012] and obtain a data matrix with 13321 genes across 641 cell lines (samples). We further download a breast cancer gene expression dataset (BRCA) from TCGA database [Koboldt *et al.*, 2012], and obtain a data matrix consisting of 11221 genes and 518 samples. For both applications, we construct a prior gene graph consisting of 13,321 genes and 262,462 interactions (a gene interaction network) from the Pathway-Commons database.

We apply sgSVD* to CGP and BRCA data with $k_u = 200$ (genes), $\sigma_u = 0.4$ and a prior gene graph denoted as $\boldsymbol{A}^1$ for gene variables, $k_v = 50$ (samples), $\sigma_v = 0$, i.e., there is no prior graph for sample variables here. For each data, we first obtain the first pair singular vectors $\boldsymbol{u}$ and $\boldsymbol{v}$. Next,



Figure 2: Comparison of three methods using CGP and BRCA data. (A) The distributions of log(FC) scores of identified modules by each method. sgSVD* shows distinct high enriched scores compared to those of sgSVD and L0SVD (Wilcoxon signed rank test p-value < 0.01) on both data. (B) The number of significantly enriched functional terms of modules by each method with respect to different significant levels with log10(p-value) from -4 to -1. sgSVD* shows distinct high enriched number of terms compared to those of sgSVD and L0SVD (p-value < 0.01) on both data.

we subtract the signal of current pair singular vectors from the input data (i.e., $\boldsymbol{X} := \boldsymbol{X} - d\boldsymbol{u}^T\boldsymbol{v}$), and apply sgSVD* again to identify the next pair singular vectors. The first 40 pair singular vectors are considered to identify 40 gene modules. Similarly, we also apply sgSVD and L0SVD to the CGP and BRCA data for comparison. We find that the gene pairs within each identified module do show distinct expression correlations by comparing the sum of absolute Pearson correlation coefficient between each pair within a module to those randomly generated ones. We also test σ_v with different values and find the corresponding results are basically consistent. Herein below, we thus only show the results obtained with $\sigma_v = 0.4$.

For a given module i of n_i genes and m_i interactions (edge) in the prior graph, we assess the edge-enrichment of the module using a Fold Change (FC) score computed as FC = $\frac{m_i/\binom{n_i}{2}}{M/\binom{N}{2}}$, where M is the total number of interactions and N is the total number of genes in the prior gene graph. We can clearly see that that the FC scores of the modules identified from CGP and BRCA data by sgSVD* are significantly higher than those of sgSVD and L0SVD (Figure 2A). In addition, the statistical significance of the FC is calculated by using the right tailed hypergeometric test. We find the percentages of edge-enriched gene modules of sgSVD* are much higher than that of sgSVD and L0SVD for different significance levels on both BRCA and CGP data (Table 1). These results suggest the modules identified using sgSVD* show distinct biological relevance than those of other methods.

To further valid our findings with biological functions, we also evaluate the functional enrichment of each module. We find that the gene modules identified by sgSVD* are significantly enriched in known Gene Ontology (GO) biological process (BP) terms at different significance levels than those of sgSVD and L0SVD in both data (Figure 2B). In addition, we find that the number of enriched modules for most significance levels of sgSVD are lower than those of L0SVD in BRCA data. It is probably because the coefficients of a number of variables linked on the prior graph have different signs in this data. Furthermore, to assess whether the number of significant GO biological processes are in favor of chance, we also perform the same test on forty random modules whose gene labels are randomly permuted. However, no significant GO BP term is discovered. All these results demonstrate that sgSVD* can identify more biologically relevant gene modules than other methods.

Table 1: The percentage (%) of significantly edge-enriched modules at different significance levels.

BRCA			**CGP**			
L0SVD	sgSVD	sgSVD*	L0SVD	sgSVD	sgSVD*	Level
57.5	60.0	**70.0**	57.5	62.5	**67.5**	0.10
57.5	57.5	**70.0**	57.5	60.0	**65.0**	0.05
55.0	57.5	**65.0**	57.5	57.5	**62.5**	0.01
55.0	57.5	**65.0**	57.5	57.5	**62.5**	0.005
55.0	57.5	**65.0**	55.0	57.5	**60.0**	0.001

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we propose a L_0-norm sparse graph-regularized SVD for biclustering high-dimensional data. We adopt the graph-regularized penalty and L_0-norm to induce structure sparsity of singular vectors and enhance intelligibility of data structure. Importantly, we consider the magnitude of singular vectors with absolute operator to overcome the opposite effect of classical graph-regularized penalty. To solve this novel model, we first find a clever trick to remove the absolute operator in the new graph-regularized penalty, and then design an efficient Alternating Iterative Sparse Projection (AISP) algorithm to solve it. We expect the proposed method can be applied to high-dimensional data from diverse domains. Moreover, it will be valuable to extend current concept into other statistical learning frameworks [e.g., Canonical Correlation Analysis (CCA), partial least square (PLS)].

Acknowledgment

This work was supported by the National Science Foundation of China [61379092, 61422309], Natural Science Foundation of Hubei Province of China 2014CFB194, and the Outstanding Young Scientist Program of CAS, and the Key Laboratory of Random Complex Structures and Data Science, CAS.

References

[Aharon *et al.*, 2006] Michal Aharon, Michael Elad, and Alfred Bruckstein. K-svd: An algorithm for designing overcomplete dictionaries for sparse representation. *IEEE Trans. on Signal Processing*, 54(11):4311–4322, 2006.

[Alter *et al.*, 2000] Orly Alter, Patrick O Brown, and David Botstein. Singular value decomposition for genome-wide expression data processing and modeling. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 97(18):10101–10106, 2000.

[Ando and Zhang, 2007] Rie Kubota Ando and Tong Zhang. Learning on graph with laplacian regularization. *NIPS*, 19:25, 2007.

[Cai *et al.*, 2011] Deng Cai, Xiaofei He, Jiawei Han, and Thomas S Huang. Graph regularized nonnegative matrix factorization for data representation. *IEEE Trans. on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 33(8):1548–1560, 2011.

[Deshpande and Montanari, 2014] Yash Deshpande and Andrea Montanari. Sparse pca via covariance thresholding. In *NIPS*, pages 334–342, 2014.

[Fan and Li, 2001] Jianqing Fan and Runze Li. Variable selection via nonconcave penalized likelihood and its oracle properties. *Journal of the American statistical Association*, 96(456):1348–1360, 2001.

[Friedman *et al.*, 2007] Jerome Friedman, Trevor Hastie, Holger Höfling, and Robert Tibshirani. Pathwise coordinate optimization. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 1(2):302–332, 2007.

[Garnett *et al.*, 2012] Mathew J Garnett, Elena J Edelman, Sonja J Heidorn, Chris D Greenman, et al. Systematic identification of genomic markers of drug sensitivity in cancer cells. *Nature*, 483(7391):570–575, 2012.

[Gu *et al.*, 2014] Quanquan Gu, Zhaoran Wang, and Han Liu. Sparse pca with oracle property. In *NIPS*, pages 1529–1537, 2014.

[He *et al.*, 2011] Ran He, Wei-Shi Zheng, Bao-Gang Hu, and Xiang-Wei Kong. Nonnegative sparse coding for discriminative semi-supervised learning. In *CVPR*, pages 2849–2856. IEEE, 2011.

[Jacob *et al.*, 2009] Laurent Jacob, Guillaume Obozinski, and Jean-Philippe Vert. Group lasso with overlap and graph lasso. In *ICML*, pages 433–440, 2009.

[Jenatton *et al.*, 2010] Rodolphe Jenatton, Guillaume Obozinski, and Francis Bach. Structured sparse principal component analysis. In *AISTATS*, pages 366–373, 2010.

[Jiang *et al.*, 2013] Bo Jiang, Chibiao Ding, Bio Luo, and Jin Tang. Graph-laplacian pca: Closed-form solution and robustness. In *CVPR*, pages 3492–3498, 2013.

[Jing *et al.*, 2015] Liping Jing, Peng Wang, and Liu Yang. Sparse probabilistic matrix factorization by laplace distribution for collaborative filtering. In *IJCAI*, pages 1771–1777, 2015.

[Koboldt *et al.*, 2012] Daniel C Koboldt, Robert S Fulton, Michael D McLellan, Schmidt Heather, et al. Comprehensive molecular portraits of human breast tumours. *Nature*, 490(7418):61–70, 2012.

[Lee *et al.*, 2006] Honglak Lee, Alexis Battle, Rajat Raina, and Andrew Y Ng. Efficient sparse coding algorithms. In *NIPS*, pages 801–808, 2006.

[Lee *et al.*, 2010] Mihee Lee, Haipeng Shen, Jianhua Z Huang, and JS Marron. Biclustering via sparse singular value decomposition. *Biometrics*, 66(4):1087–1095, 2010.

[Li and Li, 2008] Caiyan Li and Hongzhe Li. Network-constrained regularization and variable selection for analysis of genomic data. *Bioinformatics*, 24(9):1175–1182, 2008.

[Li and Li, 2010] Caiyan Li and Hongzhe Li. Variable selection and regression analysis for graph-structured covariates with an application to genomics. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 4(3):1498, 2010.

[Li and Yeung, 2009] Wu-Jun Li and Dit-Yan Yeung. Relation regularized matrix factorization. In *IJCAI*, pages 1126–1131, 2009.

[Min *et al.*, 2015] Wenwen Min, Juan Liu, and Shihua Zhang. A novel two-stage method for identifying mirna-gene regulatory modules in breast cancer. In *Bioinformatics and Biomedicine (BIBM)*, pages 151–156, 2015.

[She, 2009] Yiyuan She. Thresholding-based iterative selection procedures for model selection and shrinkage. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 3:384–415, 2009.

[Shen and Huang, 2008] Haipeng Shen and Jianhua Z Huang. Sparse principal component analysis via regularized low rank matrix approximation. *Journal of multivariate analysis*, 99(6):1015–1034, 2008.

[Shi *et al.*, 2013] Jianping Shi, Naiyan Wang, Yang Xia, Dit-Yan Yeung, Irwin King, and Jiaya Jia. Scmf: sparse covariance matrix factorization for collaborative filtering. In *IJCAI*, pages 2705–2711, 2013.

[Sill *et al.*, 2011] Martin Sill, Sebastian Kaiser, Axel Benner, and Annette Kopp-Schneider. Robust biclustering by sparse singular value decomposition incorporating stability selection. *Bioinformatics*, 27(15):2089–2097, 2011.

[Wilson and Zhu, 2008] Richard C Wilson and Ping Zhu. A study of graph spectra for comparing graphs and trees. *Pattern Recognition*, 41(9):2833–2841, 2008.

[Witten *et al.*, 2009] Daniela M Witten, Robert Tibshirani, and Trevor Hastie. A penalized matrix decomposition, with applications to sparse principal components and canonical correlation analysis. *Biostatistics*, 10(3):515–534, 2009.

[Zheng *et al.*, 2011] Miao Zheng, Jiajun Bu, Chun Chen, Can Wang, Lijun Zhang, Guang Qiu, and Deng Cai. Graph regularized sparse coding for image representation. *IEEE Trans. on Image Processing*, 20(5):1327–1336, 2011.

[Zhou *et al.*, 2015] Xun Zhou, Jing He, Guangyan Huang, and Yanchun Zhang. Svd-based incremental approaches for recommender systems. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 81(4):717–733, 2015.